

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 4-6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 42, 43 and 62 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-20, 22-30, 32-35 and 37-66 are presented for examination.

Claims 4-7, 12, 13, 22-27, 30-49 and 62-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants submit that the rejected claims have been amended to appear in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 4-14, 16, 18-27, 29, 50 and 52-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bell (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,370). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Bell.

Bell discloses a synchronous bus system that provides connections between a controller 115, which functions as a bridge between a microprocessor bus, to which one or more microprocessor devices are connected, or a memory bus to which one or more memory devices are connected, and bus expander bridges 117, 120, and 125. Bridges 117 and 120 expand and format data received across the synchronous bus to provide output to a 64 bit Peripheral Component Interface (PCI) bus or two 32 bit PCI buses to which PCI compatible devices are connected. Furthermore, the synchronous bus can provide data to a bridge that interfaces to a graphics bus and connected devices. See Bell at col. 2, ll. 15-35.

Claim 1 of the present application recites peripheral components only connected to MCH via a single interface between the MCH and ICH. Bell discloses devices coupled to the controller by at least two interfaces. For instance, Bell discloses PCI devices coupled to a

controller via a bus expander bridge 117 and a first synchronous bus, and PCI devices coupled to the controller via a bus expander bridge 120 and a second synchronous bus. Therefore, Bell fails to disclose peripheral components only connected to MCH via a single interface between the MCH and ICH. Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over Bell.

Claims 2 and 3-15 depend from claim 1 and include additional features. Thus, claims 2 and 3-15 are also patentable over Bell.

Independent claims 16, 29, 30 and 50 also recite peripheral components only connected to MCH via a single interface between the MCH and ICH. Therefore, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claims 16, 29, 30 and 50 are also patentable over Bell. Dependent claims 17-20 and 22-28, 32-35 and 37-49 and 51-66 depend from independent claims 16, 30 and 50, respectively, and include additional features. Thus, claims 17-20 and 22-28, 32-35 and 37-49 and 51-66 are also patentable over Bell.

Claims 2, 17, 30-35, 37-44, 46, 47 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,370) in view of Ram et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,722). Applicants submit that neither Bell nor Ram may be considered as prior art precluding patentability of the present application.

Section 103(c) states that:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of the subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Both Bell and Ram are considered prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because each was filed prior to the filing of the present application, but was issued after the filing of the

present application (effective filing date: 20-26-1999). Additionally, at the time of conception of the present application, the Bell and Ram references, as well as the present application were subject to an obligation of assignment to Intel Corporation. Therefore, due to the §102(e) status, and in light of §103(c), Bell and Ram cannot be used as references to preclude the patentability of claims 2, 17, 30-35, 37-44, 46, 47 and 51 under 35 U.S.C §103. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Bell and Ram

Claims 15, 28 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Lambrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,951,664). As discussed above, Bell may not be considered as prior art precluding patentability of the present application. Thus, applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Bell and Lambrecht since Lambrecht alone does not preclude the patentability of claims 15, 28 and 64.

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Ram, as applied to claims 2, 17, 30-35, 37-44 and 51 above, and further in view of Lambrecht et al. As discussed above, Bell and Ram may not be considered as prior art precluding patentability of the present application. Thus, applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Bell, Ram and Lambrecht since Lambrecht alone does not preclude the patentability of claim 45.

Claims 48 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Ram, as applied to claims 2, 17, 30-35, 37-44 and 51 above, and further in view of Gulick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,357). As discussed above, Bell and Ram may not be considered as prior art precluding patentability of the present application. Thus,

applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Bell, Ram and Gulick since Gulick alone does not preclude the patentability of claims 48 and 49.

Claims 65 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell in view of Gulick et al. As discussed above, Bell may not be considered as prior art precluding patentability of the present application. Thus, applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Bell and Gulick since Gulick alone does not preclude the patentability of claims 65 and 66.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.


The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 1, 2005



Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980